

RELEASE A. M. PAPERS OF DECEMBER 2, 1955

James Hagerty, Press Secretary to the President

---

THE WHITE HOUSE

ADDRESS OF THE HONORABLE SHERMAN  
ADAMS, THE ASSISTANT TO THE PRESIDENT  
OF THE UNITED STATES AT THE DINNER OF  
THE ADVERTISING COUNCIL IN HONOR OF  
CLARENCE FRANCIS, SPECIAL CONSULTANT  
TO THE PRESIDENT, AT THE PLAZA HOTEL,  
NEW YORK CITY, AT 7:30 P.M., DECEMBER 1,  
1955.

When I have a hard job or one which I do not know how to perform, I usually ask somebody how.

The answer to my query brought this -- the first note -- that I was to pay tribute to Clarence Francis for one minute. It seemed to me that Clarence Francis is worth at least a minute and a half. He is one of the few extremely able people in America who has never refused so far as I know, anything anybody asked him to do. When it was suggested that he was the best man who could be found to help liquidate a butter surplus of 365 million pounds he seemed surprised. I am satisfied he did not want the job, but he thought he ought to do it, and he did it.

If I had time enough, I would try to tell you just what he has done in giving a great lift to the business of selling off of commodities nobody wanted. It is quite a story. Yet there is still plenty of work remaining to be done. For instance, we own at the present time about 925 million bushels of wheat.

If Clarence Francis had been able to sell that, this meeting would have been called in the White House with the President at the head table. If he does it in '56, we will give him the White House. If he can dispose of \$7 billion worth of unneeded agricultural commodities that overhang the market in this country today, I even think he can be elected President of the United States.

Clarence Francis is one of the really superbly useful, dedicated Americans I know. His light has shone upon more than one field of intricately difficult administrative responsibilities. In public undertakings, his contribution has been outstanding. I can here give testimony to the fact that he is not only appreciated by yours truly, but by the Staff, the Cabinet, and above all, by the President of the United States. This gives me the opportunity to thank Clarence Francis publicly, on behalf of the President, for his devoted spirit and generous undertakings.

What I have to say about the President deals largely with his recovery. This, I presume, is what you expect me to talk about. The President has a very large heart. Fortunately, this is a figurative statement, and not a pathological one. As everyone knows, he passed through a few years of great anxiety. Your doctors will tell you that you cannot have a substantial thought that does not have a physical reaction. Although our President was, on the statement of his doctors, in as good physical condition as any man of his age whom they ever saw, he did suffer an injury. That injury was caused by the stress of anxious years. In the doctors' view the most anxious years were those when his actions affected the security of his country, and the lives of American boys.

more

This explains a lot of things. In it you find the principal reason why the President has considered peace the great goal of his efforts since he was elected. Fundamentally, it is the reason why peace will continue to be the goal to which his full efforts will continue to be dedicated. And he will continue to devote himself to this goal as long as he continues to be President, and thereafter, I am sure, as long as his strength remains.

If you found yourself curious about the real condition of the President at the onset of his illness, you might like to know that the most curious person was the President himself. The first time I saw him after he was ill, he said, "If the doctors here didn't tell me differently, I would think this heart attack belonged to some other guy."

In any event, it is a fact that his recovery so far is thorough and complete. You can look forward to this particular case falling into that uninspired category of figures called "average life expectancy", which means the President will probably live to an older age than you and I, that is, if you are a young man like myself.

Now the Advertising Council well knows what I think of it. For some time now I have been on the public record on this issue. To the best of my recollection, you were the most active post-election zealots of any organization in the nation. Your emissaries, Mr. West and Mr. Repplier, were early Commodore visitors, and the lecture I got about the good deeds of the Advertising Council stood me in good stead. What I have since learned is that what they told me was the truth. The Council, of course, is an indispensable mechanism. It not only has a head, but it has a heart, an attribute of the body of considerable significance these days.

The Council is truly an organization devoted to the public interest, and here the public interest is more than a couple of fuzzy words. For you it means the use of your extraordinary talents and facilities for public enlightenment -- to fulfill the need for common understanding of national urgencies of substantial importance to the peace, security, and well being of our country.

The programs you have adopted are those whose success imposes a large measure of responsibility on the part of the Government. Therefore, they are a part of the business of the Federal Administration, in short, the President's business. That you have effectively assumed the task of public information aspects of the giving of blood, for instance, the prevention of forest fires, the educational needs of our children, and the distribution of the public debt through U. S. Savings Bonds, all this has lightened the President's burden.

That brings up another subject. There has been a good deal said lately about lightening the President's load. I read recently that it was absurd that the President had to sign his name an average of 200 times a day. This is an inaccurate approximation. There are a considerable number of other misconceptions about the characteristics of his work.

A variety of ways have been devised by the Congress and the Constitution literally to require the President personally to make the major decisions. This is as it should be. No wise or responsible counsellor would divest the Office of the demands upon it which determine the principal policy. Notwithstanding, over the years there have been added duties of signature, of directive, of decision which are in the nature of duties otherwise delegated, and which properly can and should be discharged by others. It is

in this field that thorough attention is now being given toward the disposing of irrelevancies.

This by no means wholly meets the needs of the more perfect management of the Office. The physical competence of a man to carry the Presidential burden is not determined by the number of times a day he must sign his name. Rather it lies more in the competence and judgment of his appointees, his Cabinet, his Staff, and the agency chiefs to carry out their responsibilities and to discharge their trusts. The magnitude of his burden the President in great measure determines himself when he makes his appointments. The ability of a head of a vitally important federal agency to do the work set out for him without continually needing to lean upon the Chief Executive often measures his stature and his usefulness as a public servant. Sometimes, from what I read, it seems that the importance of a man in the Administration is metered by how many times a day he sees the President. Often the opposite can be the case.

The management of the Presidential Office is probably the most difficult task of its kind there is. Success in its initial organization is half the battle. It is how the Presidential appointees conduct themselves that decides the dimensions of the burden of the Office of President. There is sufficient time without over-burden for the necessary decisions, directives, yes, and signatures. There is no need to divest the Office of its vital function and the extraordinary powers reposing in it. That is where they belong.

Now I come to my assigned topic. I approach it with some misgivings.

This Summer I went to Berlin. There Ambassador Conant took me to see the great library John McCloy, formerly High Commissioner, dreamed of, and which he never saw until a few weeks ago. Here, hardly a stone's throw from the Brandenburg Gate separating free West Berlin from Communist East Berlin, close to the shambles of the Reichstag and the bombed out bunker of Hitler and Goering -- a scant half mile or so from Stalinstrasse of East Berlin -- stands a free library. There it is -- modern, beautiful free. Books, by the thousands, a cultural citadel for anybody who can read in whatever language, adult or child, whether his origins are East or West. If you reside in the East sector and are apprehended reading a capitalistic newspaper your conviction carries 25 years under close Communist military supervision. Yet the librarian told me that he estimated over 25,000 eager hungry readers had taken the subway this year from East to West Berlin to seek knowledge otherwise forbidden to them.

If you live in West Germany during these days, you are being persuaded by every conceivable means that the Soviet possesses the only remedy to a divided Germany. You are being taught that the West cannot provide it. Look at Geneva, they say, you can see for yourself.

Yet you do not want it that way. You still are distrustful of what will become of your liberty and your property. You believe in Eisenhower's sincerity of purpose, and you hope that somehow he can come back again. You feel that he will avoid the war whose weapons this time, if unloosened, means the destruction of a country like Germany. You want the West to prevail. But will it, you ask?

In a different climate, if you are an Egyptian and grow cotton, for instance, you would not be too particular whether your government sold it for you in exchange for arms from Czechoslovakia. The

more

Americans didn't want your cotton, and cotton is your bread. Wherever you are, are you so sure now that the West offers you the best choice? There are more opportunities now being offered, loans for a steel mill if you are in India, various trade and other inducements if you are in Syria, Afghanistan or Ceylon.

We are aware of all this propaganda and negotiation, of course. We are sensitive to the influences at work which underlie all of it. And we are doing our best, in company with our allies, to promote the unification of Germany and help develop political and economic stability and self-reliance among all nations who desire freedom and self-government.

Let us be sure, we Americans, that we understand all this for what it really is. Here we have a new phase of the Communist offensive. Let us be sure that we ourselves are clear about the difference between the blandishments offered in each new Soviet proffer, and what we hold out for the hope and the goal of the free world. We enter, it is true, a new phase of the cold war but the conflict is not changed. It is as ominous, as sinister, as deceptive as it has ever been. How do we meet it?

As an aftermath of Geneva somehow the notion took hold that we are involved in some new and unexpected crisis. Not so. If there has been a central purpose in the conduct of every phase of our foreign affairs, it has been the carrying out relentlessly of clearly stated objectives. Ours is a schedule of attainable strength, air squadrons, long range missiles, strategically located bases, evolving new atomic weapons, warning and communication lines on land and on the sea. These objectives, unchanged, were as explicit before Geneva as after it. We are not on a crash program basis.

Nor should we be blind to materialistic competition. The conflict of economic systems further reflect uncompromising ideological philosophies. In character was the recent reduction in the slight gains the harassed Soviet consumer was promised by the Malenkov government. It is not to the betterment of the consumers that their might and political ambition are committed. The largest peacetime military budget in Soviet history brings only increasing privation to the individual Soviet and to the satellite citizen.

While we condemn the system we seek to thwart we should be mindful of the increasing benefits of the new capitalism we seek to strengthen and preserve. We have actually achieved those things Communism empty-handedly promises. We are literally a nation of middle class, few of us very rich, few of us very poor, most of us somewhere in the middle of the economic road. The growth of the middle income population has been enormous. The abundance of our land, the leisure to enjoy it, and the opportunity to grow intellectually and culturally are being shared by more and more Americans. It is ironic that this which was Marx's dream should have come about through an evolution of the very system he so deeply reviled.

Ownership of the capital is rapidly moving into the hands of more and more Americans. The other day the Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers gave me an interesting statistic. Consumer plant and equipment in the possession of our people, in homes, automobiles and durable household goods, exceeds by one-third the value of all industrial plant and equipment in the Nation. Almost everybody has a savings account, or life

insurance, or belongs to a pension plan. More and more earnings of the individual are being invested in industry. Employees are now becoming stockholders. The funds of labor unions, in many cases, are being invested in the securities of the corporations which employ their membership.

Because the people supply both the capital and receive the benefit of our increased productivity, ~~whath~~ <sup>which</sup> has evolved in America today is truly a People's Capitalism. The Advertising Council coined that phrase, and I like it. The United States Information Agency has adopted it as a meaningful way of describing our system abroad, and has asked the Advertising Council to produce an exhibit called "People's Capitalism" for display at trade fairs around the world. That exhibit is presently building and will be set up at Union Station in Washington ~~on the 27th of this month~~, <sup>EARLY 27th FEBRUARY</sup> so many of us may see it before it begins its tour abroad.

The term "People's Capitalism" has the virtue of reclaiming for America's aggressive use words which significantly characterize the very life blood of our whole system. In 1787 it was, "We the people", who did ordain and establish our Constitution. There is scarcely a citizen who does not feel himself strongly bound to Lincoln's "of the people, by the people, and for the people", and those words now describe not only our Government but our economic system as well.

We need not and should not be foolishly apologetic for the fact that what we have in this country is capitalism. We should not try to disguise it by calling it something it is not. Instead of the term capitalism becoming a weapon to be used against us it should become a proud description of what our system in fact now is, namely a new "People's Capitalism" which serves our nation in a way no other system has ever approached.

Actually it produces ~~the~~ <sup>the most</sup> for the many. In America today it has not developed as Marx predicted. Far from the poor becoming poorer and the rich becoming richer, ever-increasing benefits have come to the great mass of our citizens. Contrast this with the wretched socialism of the Soviet, concealing behind its curtains and its barbed wire its low living standards, slave labor and cruel restrictions on personal freedom.

There is no doubt that we are in a conflict, continuing and cold. Indeed there was little to indicate that the conferences just held this year at Geneva would do much to assuage this conflict. We can claim 'E' for wholehearted effort, but what these conferences made painfully clear is the need to press relentlessly the logic and justice of our own cause. Moreover our military and economic assistance programs must be continued. We can no more abandon the support of our freedom-loving friends than we can abandon our airfields, our bases abroad, or reduce our Armed Forces.

While we seek resolutely for better formulae for peace, we still are confronted by the need to keep forging ahead in the race for intercontinental missiles, and more modern and powerful atomic weapons. With all the frustrating scurrying for maximum defensive strength, a hard task of budget balancing confronts us. While Geneva's disappointments mean no crash programs of accelerated military preparedness, they reinforce decisions already made to provide for the maximum security of our country against a hatefully expanding Communism. It is not easy to marshal public support for major expenditures of public funds for military security in the face of demands for tax reduction. It is not easy for the farm

more

- 6 -

families of America, for instance, to accept with good grace the harrowing necessity of maintaining mutual security programs of huge proportions. Yet we must not relax those efforts which meet the threat of Communist expansion. Vigilance is no dearer price to pay for our own liberty than it was to those who watched the building of this Republic.

To persuade others to our way of life we have to think for a moment, as we have tonight, of what has happened in America in the last 50 years. When we understand that it is something truly new and dynamic, we can carry that word abroad. There are I think two elements to this persuasion. The people of less-developed nations have two main concerns in determining the direction in which they will go. First, they want to follow the direction they believe to be the winning side. Second, they naturally want to pursue the path which will do the most for them in providing for their own needs, their own culture, and their own happiness.

George Mason of Virginia in the Revolutionary Convention of 1776 stated philosophically what he deemed to be one of the great objectives of the system of government then emerging. That objective was pursuing and obtaining happiness. That thought was adopted only two months later by Jefferson and his Committee in the first section of a great declaration. One of the inalienable rights of all men ought to be, they said, the pursuit of happiness.

In this Christmas season it is not inappropriate to reflect upon the significance of that thought. If it belongs to us as it belonged to them we must believe in that right for others as we believe in it for ourselves. If we do we can fervently hope and willfully strive for the sharing of that right by every man as his universal possession.

The hunger and longing of human beings for sympathy and understanding are emotions common to every man whether he be a citizen of the East or of the West. These sentiments are not expressed simply in terms of money, or in rates of interest, or in the cold terms of conventions. If we will dedicate our efforts to the understanding of Eastern peoples that Americans have a warm heart, as well as a willing hand, and hold a firm interest in their welfare as human beings, we shall move toward a far better appreciation of our purposes as a people. The world of peace for which we strive will only be won by their confidence in us as well as our confidence in them. In that spirit we can hope for a better world for us and for all mankind.